

7.6 Procedures for Approving or Objecting to Disclosure of “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL (COMPETITOR)” Protected Material to Experts.

(a) “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL (COMPETITOR)” Protected Material as used in this Section 7.6 does not apply to source code. The Parties have represented to the Court that they will submit a separate Proposed Protective Order to address source code produced in this action. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court or agreed to in writing by the Designating Party, a Party that seeks to disclose to an Expert (as defined in this Protective Order) any “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL (COMPETITOR)” Protected Material, must first make a written request disclosure to the Designating Party that (1) identifies the general categories of “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL (COMPETITOR)” Protected Material that the Receiving Party seeks permission to disclose to the Expert, (2) sets forth the full name of the Expert and the city and state of his or her primary residenceplace of business, (3) attaches a copy of the Expert’s current resume or CV, (4) identifies the Expert’s current employer(s), (5) identifies each person or entity from whom the Expert has received compensation or funding for work in his or her areas of expertise or to whom the Expert has provided professional services, including in connection with a litigation, at any time during the preceding five years and the Party to the any litigation for whom such work was done, (6) identifies (by name and number of the case, filing date, and location of court) any litigation in connection with which the Expert has offered expert testimony, including through a declaration, report, or testimony at a deposition or trial, during the preceding five years, and (7) identifies any patents or patent applications in which the Expert is identified as an inventor or applicant, is involved in prosecuting or maintaining, or has any pecuniary interest.

With regard to the information sought through part (4) of such an Expert disclosure, if the Expert believes any of this information is subject to a confidentiality obligation and/or non-disclosure agreement to a Non-Party, then the Expert should provide whatever information the Expert believes can be disclosed without violating any confidentiality agreements,

including at a minimum disclosing the existence of the confidentiality agreement and/or nondisclosure agreement, and the Party seeking to disclose to the Expert must be available to meet and confer with the Designating Party regarding any such engagement.

At least one Defendant (Meta) has, prior to this litigation, produced material to State Attorneys General in connection with State investigations addressing issues similar to those at issue in this action. Some of those materials were designated as “Confidential” as defined by and pursuant to a Confidentiality Agreement between Meta and the State Attorneys General. [Dkt. 506-1]. That Confidentiality Agreement permits the State Attorneys General to disclose information or material designated as Confidential (under the terms of that Agreement) to consultants and experts who have agreed in writing to afford such information a level of protection against disclosure that is at least as protective as the terms of that Agreement, without any prior disclosure to the Producing Party of who those experts are. *Id.* at ¶ 14(c). Defendants have re-produced in this litigation those same materials that were previously produced to the State Attorneys General (and to the extent any have not yet been re-produced, Defendants anticipate completing such re-production).

For avoidance of doubt, if a State Attorney General Plaintiff has been and/or is continuing to work with an expert or consultant on any investigations, and **not** this litigation, then the terms of the Confidentiality Agreement control and, for that reason, no disclosure of any such expert or consultant (as discussed in this Section 7.6) is required even if such expert or consultant has received or has access to material designated as “Confidential” pursuant to that Confidentiality Agreement regardless of whether it has been re-produced in this litigation.

For further avoidance of doubt, if a State Attorney General Plaintiff desires in future to disclose documents, information, or material designated by a Defendant as “**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL (COMPETITOR)**” Protected Material, where such documents, information, or material were not produced by a Defendant in connection with a State investigation (and thus were not produced pursuant to the Confidentiality Agreement in the investigations), then the disclosure requirements of this Paragraph 7.6 shall at that point be triggered.

Additionally, as required by Sections 5.1 and 5.2 herein, a Designating Party shall not over-designate produced documents, information, or material as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL (COMPETITOR)” Protected Material.

(b) A Party that makes a request disclosure and provides the information specified in the preceding respective paragraphs may disclose the subject Protected Material to the identified Expert unless, within fourteen calendar days of delivering the request, the Party receives a written objection from the Designating Party. Any such objection must set forth in detail the grounds on which it is based. Any such objection shall be reasonable and made in good faith, and shall be signed by counsel under Fed. R. Civ. P. 11.

(c) A Party that receives a timely written objection must meet and confer with the Designating Party (through direct voice-to-voice dialogue) to try to resolve the matter by agreement within ten calendar days of the written objection. The Parties shall comply with all meet and confer requirements in Section H of this Court’s Discovery Standing Order. If no agreement is reached, the Parties shall comply with Section H of the Court’s Discovery Standing Order by presenting a joint letter brief to present such Party seeking to make the disclosure to the Expert may file a motion to resolve the discovery dispute to the Court under Civil Local Rule 7 (and in compliance with Civil Local Rule 79.5, if applicable), or otherwise in accordance with any other Orders from the Court on procedures for disputes relating to discovery matters and protective orders in this matter. Each such motion must be accompanied by a competent declaration affirming that the movant has complied with the meet and confer requirements imposed in this paragraph and the Court’s Standing Orders.

In any such proceeding, the Party opposing disclosure to the Expert bears the burden of proving that the risk of harm that the disclosure would entail (under the safeguards proposed) outweighs the Receiving Party’s need to disclose the Protected Material to its Expert.